FAX

To: Kalyan K. Deshpande, USPTO

Art Unit 3623

Confirmation number 4977

FAX to 571-273-8300

November 27, 2007

From: N. K, Ouchi

Ref: 09/966,844

9 Pages plus cover letter

Examiner Deshpande

Attached is a response of the Office Action mailed September 27, 2007

The inventor appreciates your assistance

Please call me for clarification/discussion after you have read my response, my phone number is 408-757-5862.

Thank you for your assistance.

N. K. Ouchi, Inventor

Response to USPTO Office Action Mailed September 27, 2007

Confirmation Number: 4977

Examiner: Kalyan K. Deshpande

Art Unit: 3623

Title: Project Workflow System

Application Number: 09/966,844

Inventor: Norman Ken Ouchi

Date: November 27, 2007

Status: This action is FINAL

Claims 41-60 are pending

Claims 41-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Berg et al (U.S. Patent 5,999,911)

Discussion of the Claims

1) The independent claims 41, 48, and 55 have been amended to include terminology from the specification to distinguish Berg from a project management system. Specifically Berg does not provide:

a Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) or similar means to determine the critical path, the sequence of tasks based on the conditions to start or initiate each task and task duration such that all tasks are completed in minimum time, and to compute the time to complete the critical path; or

a re-plan means that reorders the sequence of tasks based on the difference between the estimated task durations and actual durations or task changes.

PERT and re-planning are well known processes and the core of all commercial project management systems such as Microsoft Project.

2) Berg (column 10 lines 58-63, column 11 lines 43-57 and column 22 lines 47-59) DO NOT describe the identification of the critical path in the Berg workflow route. Column 10 lines 58-63 describe conditional branching based on the conditions experienced in program execution. While Berg may compute the time to complete a step in the